

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/942,997

Applicant(s)

MAEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lopez

Art Unit

1731

## All Participants:

(1) Carlos Lopez.

(2) Alan Kasper.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 September 2003

Time: 2pm

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*7*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant's representative that the specification lacks antecedent basis for the claimed terminology included in claim 7 reciting "said upper and lower dies approach each other". It was thus agreed upon to amend claim 7 at lines 11-12, by deleting "making the molding surfaces of said upper and said lower dies approach each other to press said glass gob" and inserting "-pressing said glass gob by said upper and said lower dies-".